ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 9/14/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED001775	N.A.	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): Karpas, Melvin Ronald & Hornof, John A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Programs to Upgrade Culturally Deprived Youth in New York City

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Chicago Teachers College
ST.
CITY, STATE Chicago, Illinois
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	1963	25

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

Higher Horizons Program	parent role	clinical services	junior high school	
teacher role	intelligence	financial services	senior high school	talent
student attitude	tutoring	cultural events	Demonstration Guidance Project	
	guidance	elementary school	remedial education	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The two programs reviewed are the Demonstration Guidance Project and Higher Horizons Program. Characteristics of the Demonstration Guidance Project included extra teachers, special tutoring, group and individual guidance and counseling, clinical services, intensive courses in English, cultural, and artistic events. The project started with junior high school students and followed them through high school. Results showed that the IQ's of these children increased by high school age.

The Higher Horizons Program utilized the methods of the Demonstration Guidance Project. It also included elementary schools, and it allowed each elementary school to experiment in meeting its own particular requirements.

Through these special services, the students increased their educational levels and aspirations. The results showed that what the students learn is positively correlated with how much effort is made to educate them.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

Rough Draft
P. Reiser

Revised
BFAP

Return to:
Lou McDonnell
Reiser

ED001775

PROGRAMS TO UPGRADE
CULTURALLY DEPRIVED YOUTH
IN NEW YORK CITY

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DR. MELVIN RONALD KARPAS
Director, Juvenile Delinquency Research Programs
and Professor of Sociology and Education
Illinois Teachers College, Chicago (South)

Assisted by
Mr. John A. Hornof

Copyright 1963 - Melvin Ronald Karpas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Problem	1
Demonstration Guidance Project	
Schools Selected	3
The Start of The Project	4
First Project Group - Composition	5
First Project Group - Academic Arrangements	7
First Project Group - Guidance Program . . .	8
First Project Group - Psychological and Financial Assistance	9
First Project Group - Cultural Activities	10
First Project Group - Parental Education .	12
First Project Group - Results	13
Recent Developments	16
Higher Horizons Program	17
Conclusions	21
Footnotes	23
Bibliography	26

THE PROBLEM

The New York City public school system has more than 900 schools to meet the educational requirements of approximately 1,000,000 boys and girls from a widely diversified population of 7,782,000.[1] The elementary schools are graded from first to sixth; the junior high schools, from seventh to ninth; and the high schools, from tenth to twelfth. The eighty-five public high schools are further classified into fifty-six academic and twenty-nine vocational high schools and serve approximately 225,000 students.[2]

Necessarily, the New York City Board of Education must concern itself with large numbers of underprivileged children from culturally and economically deprived neighborhoods. Children who come from low status socioeconomic homes or from homes in which there is a cultural deprivation usually do not develop to their full intellectual potential. Neither do such children demonstrate the academic achievement that other more privileged children of comparable ability do; consequently, few of the underprivileged children pursue post-high school education.[3]

In fact, experience with the underprivileged children indicates that they tend to leave high school before graduation and enter the labor market at, or shortly after, the age of sixteen. The result is not only a loss of hidden human resources to the community, a loss of which officials in this country have become more aware of since the advent of Sputnik, but what should be considered of greater concern, the individual has permanently lost the realization of his full potential.[4]

In consideration for this type of child, the New York City Board of Education proposed an experimental program to enable the culturally deprived youth to pursue and succeed in post-high school education. The program was also to serve as a pilot project for other programs aimed at the discovery and stimulation of talented young people who do not display their gifts because of lack of guidance, lack of motivation, lack of information, or lack of aspiration. The sponsors believe that the program would show that the diligent search for identification of the able, that efforts at raising the sights of students and their families, and that adequate motivation to pursue higher education would produce favorable results.[5]

SCHOOLS SELECTED

The experimental program, known as the Demonstration Guidance Project, was initiated in September, 1956. The schools selected for this guidance program were Junior High School 43, Manhattan, and George Washington High School.

Junior High School 43, was selected for this project because it met, as closely as possible, the criteria set up by the Commission; namely, that the school has a low status socioeconomic and mixed ethnic population, a coeducational school population, outstanding and dedicated principal and counselor, and accessibility to an academic high school--George Washington High School--in which most of the students continue. The ethnic composition of the school population was approximately forty-eight percent Negro, forty percent Puerto Rican, and twelve percent white and oriental.[6] They came from generally low income families without an educational tradition of higher education. In the past, only a small percentage had gone on to college or post-high school education.[7]

In order to reach these children before the school-leaving age, the project was organized to begin with the junior high school students and to work with them as they progressed throughout high school.

THE START OF THE PROJECT

Though the project formally began in September, 1956, the sponsors and faculty were not sufficiently organized to begin work with the pupils until the following semester. In January, 1957, 250 students from each of the three grades attending Junior High School 43, Manhattan, were selected for the project from a total student enrollment of 1400.[8]

At an additional expense of $50 per student per year, the selected students received:

(1) group and individual guidance and counselling (parents were also counselled);

(2) clinical services;

(3) intensive courses in English (usually double periods daily);

(4) "extras", which included trips to cultural and artistic events.

As the project groups were successively graduated from Junior High School 43, Manhattan, they entered into and advanced through George Washington High School where the Demonstration Guidance Project was continued and intensified to a cost of $250 per student per year. Further screening reduced the size of the groups to 150 for each year.[9]

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - COMPOSITION

The first project group entered George Washington High School in September, 1957. It consisted of 148 boys and girls--eighty-seven Negroes, thirty-six Puerto Ricans, one Oriental, and twenty-four others--of varied intellectual achievement. Many were included for experimental purposes even though their records showed little chance of succeeding in academic work. Their I.Q.'s ranged from 70 to 141. The following table shows the percentage of the group which fell below the normal scores and the percentage of the group which obtained superior scores in selected tests.

PERCENT OF FIRST PROJECT GROUP

BELOW AND ABOVE NORMAL SCORES IN SELECTED TESTS [10]

TEST	BELOW		ABOVE	
	Score	Percent of group	Score	Percent of group
I. Q.	100	70%	120	6%
Reading	Normal	89%	Normal + 1 yr.	5%
Arithmetic	Normal	88%	Normal + 1 yr.	3%
Social Science	50th percentile	72%	70th percentile	12%
Writing	" "	70%	" "	15%
Vocabulary	" "	63%	" "	16%

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - ACADEMIC ARRANGEMENTS

Much individual attention had to be given to the students in both subject classes and guidance programs to compensate for their deficiencies. Five teachers were alloted beyond the normal quota for the 148 pupils, besides a full-time counselor and clerical assistant. Two days each week a psychologist and a social worker provided additional services.[11]

All the project students were placed in the academic course and every effort was made to help them succeed. They were grouped homogenously in each subject except art, music and health education. As many as ten separate classes were organized in the same subject to facilitate the grouping.

Classes were limited from twenty-five to twenty-eight students in English and science, and from ten to fifteen, in language and mathematics. Classes in English, science and homeroom included equal number of students from other junior high schools with approximately the same potential to facilitate social contacts. Double classes were provided in English to improve reading and writing abilities. Students were tutored after school in small groups or individually, and they were shifted to other classes in the same subject as they improved or regressed.[12]

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - GUIDANCE PROGRAM

The guidance counsellor worked very closely with the students and their teachers. He counselled the students regarding their school programs, their educational progress, their vocational plans, and their personal problems. Two-thirds of the students were interviewed four or more times a term and the counsellor interviewed many as often as twenty times. When advisable, he would recommend and effect the transfer of students from the academic course to the general or the commercial course.

Group guidance was conducted by the guidance counsellor one period a week. The tenth grade concerned itself with school orientation, good citizenship, study habits, preparations for tests and self-evaluation. The eleventh and twelfth grades concentrated on the requirements of/and the transition to college or a permanent job. Many authorities from outside the school were invited to address the students. Special instruction was provided for the filling out of various forms, particularly college and job applications. Parents also were instructed.

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - PSYCHOLOGICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The psychologist and social worker attended to students who had problems ranging from minor emotional difficulties to severe social pathology. Twenty-five percent of the class were serviced by the clinical team and half benefitted considerably. They received monetary help, acquired part-time jobs, obtained better sleeping arrangements, found places to study, improved relationships with their parents, and met school demands. Other students who had severe personal and family problems required considerably more help from the clinical team, as well as additional help from the Bureau of Child Guidance and other community agencies.

Money was given to those who needed it in order to finish school. Several students received substantial scholarships from various colleges and many grants were given to students attending local two-year or evening colleges.[14]

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Cultural activities were undertaken to personally acquaint the students with the fine arts, to provide them with satisfying sources of enjoyment, to stimulate their intellectual curiosity and to meet their emotional needs. Careful briefing sessions took place before each activity. The following table shows the activities undertaken by the first project group during their three years in attendance at George Washington High School.

ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY FIRST PROJECT GROUP [15]

September, 1957 - June, 1960

Activity	Number of Times
Museum and Library	17
Theatre	29
Concerts	30
Trips	11
Motion Pictures	5
Ballet	3

The number of pupils participating in the activities totaled 3,506 and included ten percent non-project students. The average group size was thirty-seven and the average number of participations by one student was twenty-six. This meant that each student participated generally in one

activity each month during his three years in school. Some students became devotees, on their own initiative, to certain types of activity. Many went to Sunday afternoon concerts of the Philharmonic and others to the ballet and the theatre.

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - PARENTAL EDUCATION

Parents played an important role. Every effort was made to reach parents through phone calls, letters, visits, and individual or group meetings at school. Assistance was provided to the parents to solve such problems as medical needs, unemployment and poor housing.

> Where there was poor response from parents we tried to reach older brothers or sisters, grandparents, aunts, and even neighbors. Parents who were recent arrivals from Puerto Rico and the South had to be re-educated in the folkways and mores of a different culture. They lacked an understanding of the social, emotional, and material needs of adolescents. They were not aware of, and many were not interested in, the educational and cultural opportunities available to their children. Some felt that a girl should not have more than elementary schooling.
>
> We sought to influence the parent in such things as being reasonable in the assignment of home chores to their children, in providing privacy and time for study, in encouraging good school work. We gave parents information about the school, its organization, and its activities. In some instances we encouraged the parents to attend classes in English for foreign-born. We urged parents to promote the emotional growth of their children by a more permissive attitude, and by permitting them to express their opinion in the discussion of family problems. At times we suggested that they forego the meager contributions of the child from an unskilled job so that he might spend more time in studying and preparing himself for a career. Some parents felt we were "siding with the child against the parent".
>
> When a parent refused to accept our point of view, we would try to work with other relatives who could reach the parent. Where parents were inflexible, we tried to build the child's inner strength to adjust to the situation....
>
> Financial assistance made deep impressions on many. They were incredulous, overjoyed and grateful. Some thought it a loan and wanted to know the terms of repayment.[16]

FIRST PROJECT GROUP - RESULTS

Of the original 148, 105 students still remained in the Demonstration Guidance Project at the end of their eleventh grade. In the following year, June, 1960, ninety-five of the students completed the program and were graduated. Of the fifty-three students who dropped out, twenty-two students left the city, left for schools or left for health reasons while thirty-one students left for economic reasons. The general I.Q. level of the group which left was comparable with those remaining.[17]

With the remedial work in reading and mathematics, special instruction in foreign language, cultural enrichment, and increased personal and group guidance, it was assumed that the students would show a gain in their measured I.Q. For this purpose the Pintner Advanced Form B Test of Mental Ability was administered to the first project group in May, 1959, and compared with their scores on the Intermediate Form B of this test taken in February, 1956.

The results are shown on the following table.

COMPARISON OF I.Q. DISTRIBUTIONS OF FIRST PROJECT GROUP [18]

I.Q. Range	Number of Students	
	February, 1956	May, 1959
130 plus	3	7
120-129	4	7
110-119	10	13
100-109	15	33
90-99	34	29
80-89	25	8
70-79	14	3
60-69	--	5 - why?
TOTAL	105	105
Median	93.5	102.0
Mean	95.6	102.5

Of the first project group, sixty-four percent graduated, twenty-eight percent completed the academic course and forty-one percent went on to further education. This compares with forty-seven percent, eleven percent and twelve percent, respectively, for four previous non-project groups in George Washington High School from Junior High School 43, Manhattan. [19]

Credit for the gains noted above may be attributed to the stimulation for academic work, and remedial and special instruction in both the junior

high school and the senior high school. The finding represents a reversal of the trend toward lower verbal I.Q.'s of culturally deprived children as they grow older.

> ...Studies of children in impoverished environments have shown a decrease in [I.Q.] test scores in proportion to the amount of time spent in these environments. Studies of Northern Georgia and Eastern Kentucky mountain children (Asher, 1935) and canal-boat and Gypsy children indicate that the older children in these environments do not score as well on intelligent tests as do younger children.[20]

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The Demonstration Guidance Project was planned for a period of six years, so that the 1956 seventh-grade junior high school students selected for this study could be followed through graduation from senior high school in 1962.[21] By the fourth year, June, 1959, three years of the project had been completed at Junior High School 43, Manhattan, and it was subsequently concentrated in George Washington High School. Over 700 pupils from experimental classes at Junior High School 43, had entered high school during the three-year period; nearly 600 of them rated as of experimental caliber; and, 379, of them entered into the high school project classes. In September, 1959, 314 of these were still in the project program in the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades.[22]

The high school gave the same educational and cultural advantages to the succeeding project classes as it had given to the first group. Data was gathered about the experimental pupils' attitudes, aspirations, and acceptance by means of tests, rating scales, check lists, questionnaires, compositions, school marks, regent examinations, teacher and counselor observations, and some psychological and social work studies of selected children. It has indicated that subsequent project groups will demonstrate upon the completion of the program a gain as impressive as the first project group showed, if not greater.

HIGHER HORIZONS PROGRAM

The successes of the Demonstration Guidance Project led to recommendation for its extension into other junior high schools having similar problems in educational achievement even though the economic range of the community concerned varied to some extent. It was further recommended that the expanded program should include like services to elementary schools feeding the selected junior high school in order to arrest the cumulative effect of insufficient motivation and stimulation.[23]

In September, 1959, an expanded program, incorporating these recommendations, was launched and became known as the Higher Horizons Program. It concentrated attention on 6,775 seventh grade children in thirteen junior high schools and 5,560 third grade children in thirty-one elementary schools which fed each of the junior high schools. Later it was extended to fifty-two elementary schools.[24] The program was applied to all children--bright, average and slow--in order to make it possible for each child to derive maximum benefit from a sound educational program. The decision to concentrate on a single grade in each school level was not dictated solely by budgetary problems, but also by the desireability of a gradual growth of such an extensive program.[25]

The assignment of fifty-six guidance counselors to the program reduced the average counselor-pupil ratio to one to 275 and they participated in more than 100 surveys. Fifty-eight teachers provided additional remedial services, teacher training and cultural enrichment.[26]

The participating schools were given permission to experiment and to meet their own particular requirements. To overcome deficiencies in school achievement, one school provided a double period of instruction in the mechanics of writing for ninth grade. Another school earmarked time in related classes in terms six, seven, and eight to review fundamentals in English, social studies, and accounting.[27] To meet reading problems, some schools established reading laboratories for normal or high I.Q. students with reading retardation of more than two years. In addition to the provision by many schools of special classes in remedial reading for students of low intelligence, one school reported an attempt to teach non-readers through an extensive phonics approach. In social studies some students were taken from study halls for as much as one third of a semester for additional help. Special remedial classes in mathematics and language, regular weekly reviews, and student tutoring by gifted pupils were employed to bring deficient students up to par. One school trained teachers of social studies in techniques of reading instruction suitable for developing the pupil's reading skills in those subject areas.

The problem of the potential drop-out was met, in one instance, by arranging for a modified program which included, in addition to basic instruction in English, social studies, etc., instruction in first aid, job getting, and driver education; and in another school, by authorizing a shortened school day followed by outside employment under school supervision.[28]

Several schools provided intensive individual and group counselling using homerooms, assembly periods, and special classes for such jobs. One school attempted to promote favorable attitudes toward careers in science through a supplementary reading program of selected fiction.

Concern for special needs was highlighted by such instances as providing separate required music classes for "singers" and "listeners," and separate physical training classes for "muscularly deprived," normal, and superior students. Core classes were conducted to meet special problems of the language handicapped, the slow and bright pupils.[29]

Achievements reported by the district superintendents and principals of the elementary and junior high schools during 1959-1960 were:

> Gains in reading comprehension made by third grade pupils in six months exceeded the normal expected growth by 2.3 months. They gained 8.3 months in six months.
>
> The reading score of third grade pupils in six Higher Horizon schools was three months above that of third grade pupils in six comparable non-Higher Horizon schools based on the city-wide reading survey of April, 1960.
>
> The mean reading score of all third grade pupils in Higher Horizon schools was four months higher in April, 1960, the first year of the program, as compared to the reading scores of similar groups in the same schools in April, 1958, and April, 1959, the two years before the introduction of the program.
>
> The number of school suspensions because of extreme misbehavior decreased. One school reported a drop from 30 suspensions in 1958-1959 to eleven suspensions in 1959-1960.
>
> General improvement in school tone and pupil morale and behavior.

General improvement in attendance--grade attendance above that of other grades in the school.

Increased interest in out-of-school reading as evidenced by increased numbers of children who joined neighborhood libraries and teen-age book clubs.

Greater interest in school as a whole as evidenced by requests for homework, eagerness to show projects and increased participation in various school activities.

A noticeable gain in facility in use of English language and in the quality of expression, oral and written.

Marked growth in large number of children in good habits, in ability to work individually and in self-discipline.

Better class organization and grouping, and accurate appraisal of pupil potential.

Discovery of factors inhibiting maximum achievement among children presenting no overt behavior symptoms as counselor interviews all children.

Significant increase in the number of references by students and parents.

Dramatic increase in interest of parents in school activities and in cooperation between home and school.

Improved staff morale and teamwork among supervisors, teachers, pupils and parents.

A real appreciation for and an understanding of the cultural enrichment aspects of the program.[30]

CONCLUSIONS

As shown in this paper, the Demonstration Guidance Project and the Higher Horizons Program have effected significant increases in the educational levels and aspirations of many underprivileged children. Attempts to utilize the programs as controlled experiments to determine the influence of expanded educational programs upon underprivileged children are uncertain despite the fact that several authorities feel differently. Valid comparisons require that samples correlated be random. The sample of students which were selected for and maintained in these programs were not random. The programs permitted project students to voluntarily leave the experiment and screened out ineligible ones. Biases were bound to load the sample; it is improbable that the brightest students in a project class would either voluntarily leave the program or be dropped by the authorities. On the other hand, the dullest students would surely be the most likely to leave the program for one reason or another.

Confusion existed, at first, over whether the programs were intended for all students regardless of the academic and intellectual potential, or for only average and above average students. Some sponsors who were concerned over the loss of human resources to the community suggested that the program concentrate on the early identification and development of only the potentially talented students. A practical objection to this suggestion lies in the honest acknowledgment that so-called culture fair tests and other methods for the identification of the children are of limited value. The Higher Horizons Program did not accept this suggestion.

A program for only the academically and intellectually able not only contains undemocratic implications but it is also short-sighted. Even the least able students will become more developed and will contribute more to the community, or be less of a burden, if they are better trained and educated. A society exhibits the characteristics of an organic whole and, like the human body, if one part is sick the whole suffers. Aside from the above objections based upon enlightened self-interest, the less able children should be considered for their own sake and for other spiritual reasons.

The findings of the Demonstration Guidance Project and Higher Horizons Program are not surprising. Many children who received expanded and dynamic guidance and counselling, special instruction and remedial help, broader cultural experiences, financial assistance, and clinical services demonstrated significant increases in their educational levels and aspirations. Few conclusions can be made as to which factors of the program were the most helpful.

The results of the programs to upgrade culturally deprived youth in New York City conforms with the general assumptions underlying our philosophy of education; how much man learns is positively correlated with how much effort he or others make to educate him.

F O O T N O T E S

[1] "Population of U.S. Cities, 1920-1960," INFORMATION PLEASE ALMANAC, ATLAS AND YEARBOOK (New York City, 1962), p. 424.

[2] Samuel Polatnik, Maurice D. Hopkins and Francis Griffith, "Experimentation in the New York City High Schools," BULLETIN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, XLV (February, 1961), 74.

[3] James M. Sawrey and Charles W. Telford, EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY (Boston, 1958), p. 288.

[4] William D. Boutwell, "What's Happening in Education?" THE PTA MAGAZINE, LVII (October, 1962), 11.

[5] Henry T. Hillson and Florence C. Myers, "Demonstration Guidance Project," HIGH POINTS, XLIII (May, 1961), 7.

[6] J. Wayne Wrightstone, "Demonstration Guidance Project in New York City," HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, XXX (Summer, 1960), p. 239.

[7] IBID., p. 240.

(Footnotes cont., p. 2)

[8] Eugene Maleska, "Stirrings in the Big Cities: New York," THE NEA JOURNAL, LI (May, 1962), p. 21.

[9] IBID., pp. 21-22.

[10] Hillson and Myers, OP. CIT., pp. 8-9.

[11] IBID., p. 11.

[12] IBID., p. 13.

[13] IBID., pp. 13-14.

[14] IBID., p. 15.

[15] IBID., p. 20.

[16] IBID., pp. 15-16

[17] IBID., p. 12.

[18] Wrightstone, OP. CIT., p. 241.

[19] Hillson and Myers, OP. CIT., pp. 10-11.

(Footnotes cont., p. 3)

20 Sawrey and Telford, OP. CIT., p. 294.

21 Wrightstone, OP. CIT., p. 238.

22 "Portals to the Future," 1959-60 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, p. 3.

23 IBID., p. 5.

24 Maleska, OP. CIT., pp. 21-22.

25 "Portals to the Future," OP. CIT., p. 6.

26 IBID., p. 6.

27 Polatnik, et. al., OP. CIT., pp. 74-75.

28 IBID., p. 75.

29 IBID., p. 76.

30 "Portals to the Future," OP. CIT., pp. 5-6.